

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/973,385	Applicant(s) SOLTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Maury Audet	Art Unit 1654	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Maury Audet.

(3) _____.

 (2) Steve Holmes, Attorney for Applicant.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Related pending applications.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: An Examiner's Amendment to claims 1, 3, 13-14, 23, 25, and 27 was proposed to Attorney, which was accepted. Additionally, the Examiner noted that provisional non-statutory obvious-type double-patenting rejections over related co-pending applications 09/973,263 and 09/973,332 were inadvertently omitted in the Office Action of 11/21/2003 . Attorney agreed to Fax Terminal Disclaimers over both pending applications.